

35

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELISHA R. POTTER,

OF SOUTH KINGSTON,

MARCH 14, 1863.

UPON THE

PRESENT NATIONAL DIFFICULTIES.

WITH AN APPENDIX.



PROVIDENCE:

COOKE, JACKSON & COMPANY, PRINTERS,

1863.

SPEECH
OF
HON. ELISHA R. POTTER,
OF SOUTH KINGSTON,
MARCH 14, 1863.
UPON THE
PRESENT NATIONAL DIFFICULTIES.
WITH AN APPENDIX.

PROVIDENCE:
COOKE, JACKSON & COMPANY, PRINTERS,
1863.

“If Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him, have a matter against any man, THE LAW IS OPEN, and there are deputies; let them implead one another.”—ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 19 : 38.

S P E E C H
O F
HON. ELISHA R. POTTER,
OF SOUTH KINGSTON,

IN THE SENATE OF RHODE ISLAND, MARCH 14, 1863.*

MR. POTTER introduced the following Resolution :—

Resolved, That in the opinion of this General Assembly, it is desirable to effect a settlement of our present National difficulties upon the basis of a restoration of the Constitutional rights of all the States as soon as it can honorably be done.

Mr. Potter said, that in July, 1860, Edward Everett delivered one of his best-written and most-widely circulated speeches, in which, in answer to some attacks from European sources on our Democratic institutions, he magnified the glory and power of our Republic, and the success of Democracy. In six months from that time, we were sundered in pieces.

While the mass of the people of all parties are honest, and sincerely attached to our Constitution, our politicians have been growing more and more corrupt; and it is a common remark, that we have been going down hill as to political honesty, and the character of the men we have chosen to govern us. Our Presidential candidates have been chosen for availability. Stump-speaking has been rated higher than

*The references and quotations which were omitted in speaking are here printed in full, and other portions written out from the notes used at the time.

statesmanship. The men we have sent abroad to represent us, have, with few exceptions, been a disgrace to us. At a time when, at the most important Court in Europe, we should have had our ablest man, we have not one man in our Legation who can speak French; while the Confederates are represented there by one of the ablest men in the whole country, and perfectly familiar with the language. This alone is enough to account for a large portion of the misunderstanding of our cause, and the trouble we have had with foreign nations. Why was not Charles Sumner sent abroad, where his European reputation could have been of some service to our cause?

It is of no use now quarreling about the origin of the war. While both sides are to blame, the rebellion was unjustifiable; because, if the Southern members had remained in Congress, their rights could not have been injured. But it is easy to see that the conflict could not have been put off much longer. With so many, both at the South and North, going to extremes, the agitation would have continued. It has not grown out of any love for the slave. It is, in a great measure, a contest for political control. Extracts from the Charleston Mercury, which represented a small clique of ultras, were re-published here as representing Southern opinion; and extracts from abolition papers were re-published at the South, as representing Northern opinion; when in reality, not one in a hundred here cared anything at all for the negro. The John Brown raid, and the brutal assault on Sumner, completed the alienation of feeling, and made it easy for the politicians to lead the masses on to secession.

The South are merely carrying into effect what all parties and sections of the Union have at one time or another advocated. Secessionism is said to have begun with the devil. It is, perhaps, older than that. But in our history, we find it appearing very early. The United States Constitution was itself a secession. By the terms of the old Confederation, it

was to be perpetual, and no State had a right to leave it, any more than to secede from our present Constitution. But eleven States did secede, and formed the present Constitution, and left Rhode Island and North Carolina *out in the cold*, and they had to submit and come in! * As soon as the Union was formed, dissension began. When the assumption of debts was proposed, there were threats of disunion if it was not adopted.

But the most violent dissensions were produced by the admission of Louisiana, and the War of 1812.

When Louisiana was acquired, the question arose whether Congress could acquire new territory, and could admit new States out of such territory. If the Union could be extended indefinitely West, it was easy to see that the Eastern States would soon lose their comparative strength and influence. And so they viewed it. Hon. Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, in a speech in Congress, January 14, 1811, used this remarkable language: "I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this *Union* are virtually *dissolved*; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation, — amicably, if they can; *violently, if they must!*"

And Josiah Quincy was right. Jefferson himself had acknowledged that the Constitution had not contemplated such a case. But the people acquiesced in the violation, and time has given it its sanction.

The embargo and the difficulties which followed, and ended in the War of 1812, produced a most violent opposition at the East. New England resisted the attempt of the General Government to control the militia of the States. When the Federalists lost power, John Quincy Adams became a Republican, and he afterwards openly charged his old New England friends with attempting to dissolve the Union.

* Judge Tucker's Notes to Blackstone.

In 1814, a joint committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on petitions for redress, made a report on their grievances. The petitioners had declared the embargo a gross violation of the Constitution, and more odious than the Boston Port Bill, which roused the Colonies to rebellion. The committee say : “ A power to regulate commerce, is abused when employed to destroy it ; and a voluntary abuse of power sanctions the right of resistance, as much as a direct and palpable usurpation. The *sovereignty reserved to the States*, was reserved to protect the citizens from acts of violence by the United States, as well as for purposes of domestic regulation. We *spurn the idea* that the FREE, SOVEREIGN and INDEPENDENT STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS is reduced to a *mere municipal* corporation, without power to protect its people or to defend them from oppression, from *whatever quarter* it comes. Whenever the national compact is violated, and the citizens of this State oppressed by cruel and unauthorized enactments, this Legislature is bound to *interpose* its power, and to wrest from the oppressor his victims.” *

The Hartford Convention soon followed. It was composed of delegates appointed by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and some others, appointed from different localities. Their report is dated January 4, 1815, and is signed by George Cabot, Nathan Dane, H. G. Otis, Wilde, Lyman, James Hillhouse, Judge Swift, Nathaniel Smith, Calvin Goddard, Roger M. Sherman, *Benjamin Hazard, Daniel Lyman, Edward Manton, and Samuel Ward*, and others.

In the long and able report of this Convention, signed by all the members, they say : “ That acts of Congress in violation of the Constitution, are absolutely void, is an undeniable

* Before the adoption of the national form of government, the State of Massachusetts possessed *every attribute* of SOVEREIGNTY, &c.

Report on so much of the Governor's Message as relates to his application to the Secretary of War, &c., October 18, 1814.

proposition. It does not, however consist with the respect and forbearance due from a *Confederate State* towards the General Government, to fly to open resistance upon every infraction of the Constitution. The mode and the energy of the opposition should always conform to the nature of the violation, the intention of its authors, the extent of the injury inflicted, the determination manifested to persist in it, and the danger of delay. But in cases of deliberate, dangerous and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the *sovereignty of a State*, and the liberty of the people, it is not only THE RIGHT BUT THE DUTY of the *State* to INTERPOSE its authority for their protection, in the *manner best calculated to secure* that end. When emergencies occur which are either beyond the reach of the judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, STATES which have *no common umpire*, must be THEIR OWN JUDGES, AND EXECUTE THEIR OWN DECISIONS."

It is curious to observe the changes in opinion in different sections of the country. While the elder Adams was in power, the Northern people were for a strong General Government, and the Southern statesmen were for States' rights, and the resolutions of 1798. When the Southern influence prevailed, and up to and after the War of 1812, the New England politicians asserted the rights of the States in language which even Mr. Calhoun never exceeded. In the War of 1812, the General Government undertook to take the control of the militia into its own hands, and many of the States resisted it. The Hartford Convention express their opinion on this subject in strong language: "The power of compelling the militia and other citizens of the United States, by a *forcible draft or conscription*, to serve in the regular armies, . . . is not delegated to Congress by the Constitution; and the exercise of it would be not less dangerous to their liberties, than hostile to the *sovereignty of the States*. The effort to deduce this power from the right of raising armies, is a flagrant attempt to pervert the sense of the clause in the Constitution which confers that

right, and is incompatible with other provisions in that instrument." And they also "Resolved, that it be and hereby is recommended to the Legislatures of the several States represented in this Convention, to adopt all such measures as may be necessary effectually to *protect* the citizens of said States from the operation and effects of all acts which have been or may be passed by the Congress of the United States, which shall contain provisions subjecting the militia, or other citizens, to *forcible drafts, conscriptions, or impressments*, not authorized by the Constitution of the United States."

And the most wonderful changes have taken place in public opinion since the war commenced. Our Northern people, who had got to be so tender-hearted that they could not hang a villain for the worst of crimes, now talk familiarly of hanging and bloodshed. Peace societies are done with, and their leaders are urging on the war. Our clergy formerly prayed for the spread of the Gospel of peace. Now we have had one of the leading ones among them praying for the coming of the dispensation of hemp. It used to be thought that the New Testament contained the latest revelation of God's will, and that the Old Testament contained the history of a dispensation calculated for older times, but superseded in some respects by the Gospel of the Prince of Peace. But one of our most distinguished clergymen has made the discovery that the imprecatory Psalms are especially adapted to enable the Northern people to curse their enemies in sacred language, and that it is another proof of the inspiration of the Bible, that it contains something adapted to the situation of all sorts of people, and to express all sorts of passions. Another distinguished clergyman has published an article in which, in the most cold-blooded manner, he speculates upon the devastation of the South and the re-peopling of it by Yankee colonists. One would suppose that if we are to cite the example of David for cursing his enemies, and of the Jews in exterminating and driving out the Canaanites and taking possession, that logical consistency would allow the

Mormons the benefit of the example of the Hebrew patriarchs, and that Hebrew laws might be quoted in favor of slavery. But in times of excitement, consistency is not to be expected. We must at least allow to Bishop Polk the credit of practising what he preaches. He urges others to fight, and fights himself.

When a few years ago Gen. Jackson declared he should carry out the Constitution as *he* understood it, he was denounced by the whole North. Lately, John Quincy Adams and Senators Sumner and Collamer have justified his conduct in making the declaration. Formerly, the South were jealous of the Supreme Court, and the North sustained it. Now, the reverse.

And Jefferson and Jackson, who were formerly regarded in New England as almost demons, are now quoted as the highest authority.*

This change from mildness to cruelty is nothing new. When Nero began his reign, he dreaded being obliged to affix his signature to a death warrant. Humane theorists began the French revolution. But the expressions of cruelty, threats of hanging, &c., are most frequent among those who are not fighting, and never mean to fight.

Our leaders have utterly despised all the lessons of history. We should have profited by the history of our own revolution. Almost everything that happened then, has had its counterpart in the present rebellion. Great Britain had a population of twelve millions, the colonies about three millions of whites, and half a million of slaves. They had a great navy, the colonies none. But we produced a Paul Jones who devastated their commerce. They cut off our trade, but our fathers made out to live and fight on homespun cloth, herb tea and cornstalk molasses.

* The feeling of a large portion of the New England people towards Jefferson, during his contest for the Presidency, is shown in the following extract from the *New England Palladium* (Boston) :—

“Should the infidel Jefferson be elected to the Presidency, the seal of death is that moment set on our holy religion; our churches will be prostrated, and some infamous prostitute, under the title of the Goddess of Reason, will preside in the sanctuaries now devoted to the Most High.”

The British took and held nearly all the *cities* of America. But they could hold nothing beyond the territory actually occupied by their troops. Lord Dunmore proclaimed freedom to the slaves in Virginia. He hoped, he said, to oblige the rebels to disperse to take care of their families and property. His proclamation excited universal condemnation. Bancroft strongly censures it. But the slaves did not run away. Some of the colonies freed them and they fought for their masters. The British insisted their government was a blessing to the colonies, and General Gage recommended, as a terrible punishment, to cut the colonies adrift and leave them to anarchy and repentance.*

General Grant declared in Parliament, *amid the loudest cheering*, he knew the colonies well, they *would not fight*, and a very slight force would be sufficient to reduce them.†

General Gage called for 20,000 men. The ministry thought so large a force would not be needed. They demanded unconditional submission. The colonies demanded their rights. A mere minority were at first for complete independence. But it went on untill the minority became a majority and the colonies declared their independence, when (says Bancroft) it "was no longer a *civil war*. Britain became to the United States a foreign country."‡

It was held then as now that rebels had no rights, and savages were employed against them. The colonies had friends in England who aided them, and subscribed to help the prisoners who were carried to England. Chatham and Burke defended them in Parliament and urged reconciliation, but in vain. Their advice was scorned. Their speeches, read at this day in the light of history, seem like the warnings of prophecy.

I read a few extracts from Lord Chatham's speeches.

"The infant complaints of Boston were literally treated like the capricious squalls of a child, who, it was said, did not know

* Bancroft's United States, 7, 177.

† Bancroft, 8, 218, 220.

‡ Bancroft, 8, 474.

whether it was aggrieved or not. . . . We are told in the language of menace that if seventeen thousand men wont do, fifty thousand shall. It is true with this force they may ravage the country, waste and destroy as they march ; but in the progress of fifteen hundred miles, can they occupy the places they have passed ?” . . . He then moves a petition to the King to order General Gage to remove the English troops from Boston. “ Such conduct will convince America that you mean to try her cause in the spirit of freedom and inquiry, and not in letters of blood.”

“ In a good cause on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. . . . In such a cause (the Stamp act) America if she fell, would fall like the strong man. She would embrace the pillars of the State and pull down the Constitution along with her.”

“ You have ransacked every corner of Saxony, but forty thousand German boors can never conquer ten times the number of British Freemen. They may ravage they cannot conquer. . . . Why, what would you conquer? The *map of America!* . . . You have gained nothing in America but stations. . . . If you conquer them, what then? You cannot make them respect you. You cannot make them wear your cloth. You will plant an invincible hatred in their breast against you. . . . We have tried for unconditional submission. Let us try what can be done or obtained by unconditional redress.”

“ This not a time for adulation. The smoothness of flattery cannot now avail. . . . It is now necessary to instruct the throne in the language of truth ; we must dispel the delusion and darkness which envelop it. . . . The crown from itself, and by itself, declares an unalterable determination to pursue measures that have produced the imminent perils that threaten us, the measures that have brought ruin to our doors. . . . I love and honor the English troops. I know they can achieve anything except impossibilities, and I know that the conquest of

English America is an impossibility. . . . It irritates to an incurable resentment the minds of your enemies, to overrun them with the mercenary sons of rapine and plunder, devoting them and their possessions to the rapacity of hireling cruelty. If I were an American, as I am an Englishmen, while a foreign troop remained in my country, I never would lay down my arms ; never, never, never.”

Edmund Burke also tried in vain to resist the popular storm ; for it was not only the King who was for subjugation. The British people considered the colonies as *their* colonies. The questions of slavery, treason, treatment of prisoners, privateers, are all discussed in his speeches.

The following extracts are from his speech on conciliation of America : —

“ With regard to the high aristocratic spirit of Virginia and the Southern colonies, it has been proposed, I know, to reduce it, by declaring a general enfranchisement of their slaves. This project has had its advocates and panegyrists, yet I never could argue myself into any opinion of it! Slaves are often much attached to their masters. A general wild offer of liberty would not always be accepted. History furnishes few instances of it. It is sometimes as hard to persuade slaves to be free, as it is to compel freemen to be slaves, and in this auspicious scheme, we should have both these pleasing tasks on our hands at once. But when we talk of enfranchisement, do we not perceive that the American *master may enfranchise too*, and arm servile hands in defence of freedom? A measure to which other people have had recourse more than once, and not without success, in a desperate situation of their affairs.”

“ Perhaps I am mistaken, in my idea of a great empire, as distinguished from a single State or Kingdom. But my idea of it is this, than an empire is the aggregate of many States under one common head, whether this head be a monarch or a presiding republic. It does in such constitutions frequently hap-

pen (and nothing but the dismal, cold, dead uniformity of servitude can prevent its happening,) that the subordinate parts may have many local privileges and immunities." . . . All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences ; we give and take ; we remit some rights that we enjoy to others ; and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants."

And in his letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol on the American war, in discussing the question of privateering which it was proposed to punish as piracy, he says : " The general sense of mankind tells me that those offences which may probably arise from mistaken virtue, are not in the class of infamous actions," and that no one ought to " contend for executions which must be retaliated on his own friends," or " think the defeats in America compensated by the triumphs of Tyburn." . . . " If all this vast continent should unanimously concur in thinking that no ill fortune can convert resistance to the royal authority into a criminal act, we may call the effect of our victory peace or what we will ; but the war is not ended, the hostile mind continues in its full vigor, and it continues under a worse form," &c., &c.

" If the prisoners who have been exchanged, have not by that exchange been *virtually pardoned*, the cartel is a cruel fraud. . . . If our present enemies be in reality and truth rebels, the King's generals have no right to release them upon any conditions whatever ; and they are themselves answerable to the law and as much in want of a pardon for doing so, as the rebels whom they release."

" Lawyers, I know, cannot make the distinction, for which I contend ; because they have their strict rule to go by. But legislators ought to do what lawyers cannot ; for they have no other rules to bind them, but the great principles of reason and equity and the general sense of mankind. . . . If we had adverted to this, we never could consider the convulsions of a

great empire, not disturbed by a little disseminated faction, but divided by whole communities and provinces, as fit matters of discussion under a commission of Oyer and Terminer."

"Partial freedom seems to me a most invidious kind of slavery. But unfortunately it is the kind of slavery most easily admitted in times of civil discord; for parties are but too apt to forget their own future safety in the desire of sacrificing their enemies. People, without much difficulty, admit the entrance of that injustice, of which they are not to be the immediate victims," &c., &c. "Civil wars strike deepest of all into the manners of a people. They vitiate their politics; they corrupt their morals; they pervert even the natural taste and relish for equity and justice."

"America is not subdued. . . . You have the ground you encamp on, and you have no more. The cantonments of your troops and your dominions are exactly of the same extent. You spread devastation, but you do not enlarge the sphere of authority." And he considers no person "more truly odious and disgusting than an impotent, helpless creature, without civil wisdom or military skill, without a consciousness of any other qualification for power but his servility to it, bloated with pride and arrogance, *calling for battles which he is not to fight*, contending for a violent dominion which he can never exercise, and satisfied to be himself mean and miserable, in order to render others contemptible and wretched. . . . The addressers offer their own persons, and they are satisfied with hiring Germans. They promise their private fortunes, and they mortgage their country. They have all the merit of volunteers without risk of person. . . . Is it the force of the Kingdom they call for? They have it already; and if they choose to fight their own battles in their own persons, nobody prevents their setting sail to America in the next transports. Do they think the service is stinted for want of liberal supplies? They complain without reason. . . . It ought to be our wish, as it is our duty, not only to forbear this style of outrage, but to make every one as sensible

as we can of the impropriety and unworthiness of the temper which gave rise to it, and which designing men are laboring with such malignant industry to diffuse among us."

"Many have been taught to think that moderation in a case like this is a sort of treason, and that all arguments for it are sufficiently answered by railing at rebels and rebellion. . . . *Declaiming on rebellion* never added a bayonet or a charge of powder to your military force, but I am afraid that it has been the means of taking up many muskets against you. . . . The American leaders seem to have had the greatest difficulty in bringing up their people to a declaration of total independence. *But the Court Gazette accomplished* what the abettors of independence had attempted in vain."

And speaking of the authority given to the generals to restore the trade of any district which might submit, and of their management in regard to it, "we see well enough to what the whole leads. The trade of America is to be dealt out in *private indulgences and graces*: that is, in jobs to recompense the incendiaries of war. They will be informed of the proper time in which to send their merchandise. . . . One set of merchants are to be rewarded for the pretended zeal of which another set are their dupes."

"I cannot discern the least advantage, . . . if we were able to persuade our colonies that they had not a single friend in Great Britain. On the contrary, . . . I conceive it would be happy for us if they were taught to believe that there was even a formed American party in England, to whom they could always look for support. . . . When war finally breaks out, shall no man express his desires of peace? . . . When they found that neither prayers nor menaces had any sort of weight, but that a firm resolution was taken to reduce them to *unconditional* obedience by a military force, they came to the last extremity. Despairing of us, they trusted in themselves. . . . It is said that being at war with the colonies . . . all the policy we have left is to strengthen the hands of the government

to reduce them. On the principle of this argument, the more mischief we suffer from any administration, the more our trust in it is to be confirmed. Let them but once get us into a war and then their power is safe and an act of oblivion passed for all their misconduct."

And he declares his *preference* for independence, retaining the good will of the Americans, to subjugation with their hate. "Liberty is in danger of being made unpopular to Englishmen. . . The principles of our forefathers becomes suspected to us because we see them animating the present opposition of our children. . . The least resistance to power appears more inexcusable in our eyes than the greatest abuses of authority. All dread of a standing military force is looked upon as a superstitious trick. All shame of calling in foreigners and *savages* in a civil contest, is worn off. We grow indifferent to the consequences inevitable to ourselves from the plan of ruling half the empire by a mercenary sword. We are taught to believe that a desire of domineering over our countrymen is love to our country," &c., &c.

Bishop Bossuet, in speculating upon the causes of the conquest of Carthage by Rome, after a contest of many generations, gives us his ideas of the character and pursuits of the two peoples. Carthage had grown wealthy, her people devoted to trade, and unpractised in warlike arts; not fighting their own battles, but dependent on foreign troops; and divided by factions. The Romans, an agricultural people, comparatively poor, fond of military glory; with an army composed of their own citizens, rich as well as poor; united and all faction broken down in defending their homes from foreign invasion, finally carried the war into Africa and conquered their invaders.

Devoted as we are to gain, it is fortunate this war has come upon us before our whole people have become corrupted by it.

In the conduct of the war against the rebels, we seem to have forgotten also all the lessons of our own history, our own rebellion against Great Britain, and our conduct toward the Spanish

provinces when they revolted from Spain; and we do not practice now what we preached then.

We have undertaken to close the rebel ports by act of Congress, forgetting that our government (through John Quincy Adams) most ably argued against and denounced the right claimed by Spain to do the same thing.* We undertook, after the Southern Declaration of Independence, having always before refused, to give in our adhesion to the Declaration of Paris abolishing privateering; thinking, probably, that the old government could (at any rate before recognition) bind the rebels by it; forgetting that the same John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, had denied the power of Spain to bind her rebellious provinces by treaty after they had declared themselves independent of her.† We undertook to punish privateers as pirates, forgetting the case of our own revolution, and forgetting our treatment of the South American privateers and the decisions of our courts respecting them. And, finally, we have undertaken to emancipate the slaves of the enemy. In this, too, we have gone contrary to all our own previous doctrines, and it may be well to refer to them.

In the war of 1812 with England, English officers issued their proclamations instigating our slaves to revolt. Many slaves were carried away. After the war, the United States

* Upton's Law of Nations, page 213, quotes Chief Justice Marshall as saying: "A sovereign who is endeavoring to reduce his revolted subjects to obedience, possesses both sovereign and belligerent rights, and is capable of acting in either character, if as legislator, &c." *Rose v. Himely*, 4 Cranch, 272.

There may be an edition of Cranch's Reports which I have not seen, but in the one I have at hand, it reads thus: "It is not intended to say that belligerent rights may not be superadded to those of sovereignty. But admitting a sovereign who is endeavoring to reduce his revolted subjects to obedience to possess both sovereign and belligerent rights, and to be capable of acting in either character, the manner in which he acts must determine the character of the act. If as a legislator, &c."

† John Q. Adams, Secretary of State, to Mr. Anderson, 1823. United States Folio State Papers, Foreign Affairs, vol. 5, 896.

claimed their restoration, and on arbitration it was decided in our favor. Mr. Adams also argued this case for the United States. In his dispatch to Mr. Rush, July 7, 1820, he declares that "the emancipation of an enemy's slaves is not among the acts of *legitimate warfare*." And in a dispatch October 18, 1820: "The British have broadly asserted the right of emancipating slaves, private property, as a legitimate right of war. *No such right is acknowledged as a law of war by writers who admit any limitation.* THE RIGHT OF PUTTING TO DEATH ALL PRISONERS IN COLD BLOOD, AND WITHOUT SPECIAL CAUSE, MIGHT AS WELL BE PRETENDED TO BE A LAW OF WAR, OR THE RIGHT TO USE POISONED WEAPONS, OR TO ASSASSINATE." In a letter August 22, 1815, he says: "We considered the proclamations issued by the British officers as deviations from the usages of war."

In the war of the revolution, Lord Dunmore issued a proclamation, offering freedom to the slaves in Virginia. Botta, whose history was so long a standard work, thus condemns it: —

"Lord Dunmore proclaimed martial law; the effect of which would have been to suspend all civil authority in the province. He exhorted the loyalists to repair to the royal standard; to retain in their hands the contributions due to the crown, as well as other taxes, until the re-establishment of peace. Moreover, he declared free all slaves or servants, black or white, provided they should take arms and join the royal troops.

"This proclamation, and especially the clause concerning slaves, proved that Lord Dunmore was a man extremely deficient in prudence and moderation. In the colonies, and even in all other countries, an universal cry arose against a measure which tended to disturb society in its very foundations, to destroy domestic security, to engender mortal suspicions, and to excite a race, naturally ferocious, to vengeance and to murder. In fact, this step of the Governor was not merely useless, — it

was pernicious ; it irritated the minds of the greater number, and gained over none." *

Bancroft, also, whose history of the United States has been so popular, condemns it in the strongest language.† The celebrated John Jay, of New York, Secretary of the United States for Foreign Affairs, in 1786, insisted on the validity of the claim of the United States, to be repaid for all the slaves who, confiding in British promises of freedom, had fled from their masters.‡

And one of the complaints alleged in the Declaration of Independence, against George the Third, as a justification for declaring ourselves independent, is that he had excited DOMESTIC INSURRECTION amongst us.

When, in November, 1777, in the British Parliament, Lord Suffolk proposed to employ the savages against the Americans, and maintained that "they had a right to use all the means that God and nature had put in their hands to conquer them," Lord Chatham, the friend of America, denounced the proposition as *inhuman* and *unchristian*. "I know not what ideas that lord may entertain of God and nature, but I know that such abominable principles are equally abhorrent to religion and humanity. . . . They shock every sentiment of honor ; they shock me as a lover of honorable war, and a detester of murderous barbarity. These abominable principles, and this more than abominable avowal of them, demand the most decisive indignation."

And yet in the year of Grace 1863, we have a Cambridge Professor of Law, whose father or grandfather was *probably* a rebel, maintaining that "Rebellion has no rights. . . . It is accursed before God and man. . . . No rebel has *any right* to a regard which should weaken or obstruct ANY military measure needed to subdue the rebellion" !

* History of the United States, vol. 1, p. 230, edition of 1826.

† Bancroft, vol. 8, 223.

‡ Lawrence's Wheaton.

And has he forgotten the decision of a certain Chief Justice Parsons, sustaining the State of Massachusetts, in the war of 1812, in resisting the attempt of the general government to control the militia of Massachusetts? *

And we find George Bancroft advancing the strange doctrine that because the Confederate States are a new nation, formed since the Declaration of Paris of 1856, they have by international law no right to arm privateers! †

If the emancipation proclamation was only intended (as Mr. Sydney Fisher seems to argue, and as the New York *Tribune* and Mr. Richard H. Dana now say) as a pledge of freedom to slaves as fast as our armies advanced, there was no need of it. The slaves were escaping as fast as they could, and we had a right to make use of them, and all northern men approved of it. This was legitimate war. No administration would ever have dared to return them. But the language of the proclamation goes far beyond this, or it would not have satisfied the abolitionists. If it was intended to please the abolitionists, it has divided the North. If intended to excite a slave insurrection, then it is liable to all the objections we have stated. It has united the South, and as to any injury it has done them, has turned out just as President Lincoln told those who urged it, it would turn out—it has had no more effect than “the Pope’s bull against the comet.”

A simple order, not to return any slaves, would have answered all purposes. No slaves should be returned. One of the most disgraceful events in the whole war was the coming away from the Vicksburg Canal and leaving seven hundred slaves, who had worked for us on it, to the tender mercies of their former masters. And some of our officers, as appears from the evidence before the McDowell Commission, have sent back fugitive slaves, and traded them away for cotton. ‡

* Massachusetts Reports, vol. 8.

† Report on Exchange of Prisoners.

‡ While this is going through the press, it is stated that a large number of

If the Southern States are still under the Constitution, the President has no such constitutional power. If they are a foreign power to us, then the question is, would it be a legitimate mode of warfare if we were at war with a foreign nation? If England or France had made war with us, and had done the same thing, would it have been civilized war?

The history of parties, and of factions within parties, during our war of 1812, would throw some curious light upon the tendency of parties at the present time.

I have not referred to historical examples for the sake of discouragement, but to show that our political and newspaper leaders have utterly disregarded all experience of our own and other nations in similar cases. As Lord Chatham said of England and the colonies, in a war conducted *honestly* and according to the rules of civilized war and for the object of *restoring the Constitution*, the North would be united, and the strength of the South would be as nothing in comparison.

But, as I have said, it is of no use quarrelling about the causes of the war. It is begun, and we must go on with it until we can have an *honorable* settlement, and it is with this view I have drawn this resolution.

That the war cannot be *honorably* settled, at present, is evident. Neither party is in a mood for it. Neither party has suffered enough yet. While all the southern papers say they will accept of nothing short of independence, some of them go farther, and say they would not agree to a peace except on terms which would allow any of the Northern States to join them, who should choose so to do.

The Northern States ought to be willing to suffer a great deal, and for years, rather than agree to a division of the country. If the Border States go with the South, the East and West would be connected by only a narrow strip of land, and

slaves who had assisted our soldiers in collecting cotton on the Mississippi, were, against their entreaties, left behind by our troops, and four of them shot by the planters for aiding us!

separation would be almost inevitable. The interest of the East and West are entirely different. We may think and try to argue ourselves into the belief that their interest is the same with ours. Whether it is or not, if they believe their interest to be different, the effect is the same. And with their corn ten cents a bushel and railroads owned by Eastern men, making all the profits, and even raising the rate of freight in their distress, and a tariff increasing the prices of their necessities, it is no wonder that a large portion of them should be discontented. Nothing but intense attachment to the old Union and the immense expenditures of government money which have afforded partial relief, have prevented an outbreak there.*

Thus, a separation of the South, *inevitably* leads in a few years to the separation of the West, and perhaps to reconstruction of the Union, leaving New England out. And however much we may have blamed some portions of our people for that abuse and invitation which indulged in by the extremists on both sides, have precipitated this war upon us, in that event, there could be but one feeling in New England. Even in case the East and West remain united, which is not very probable, we should have perpetual war with the South; the surrender of fugitives would be still a cause of contention, and we should be at the mercy of any alliance which the South might choose to make with foreign powers.

While, therefore, separation and permanent peace seem almost impossible, on the other hand we have a party among us clamoring for subjugation and unconditional submission. If this means that they ought to come back under the Constitution, it is one thing. But if it means, as it probably does, that seven millions of white people, as brave as ourselves, are expected to fall on their knees and beg for mercy, quit their homes and surrender them to Yankee colonists, and give up their State organizations and come back as Territories of the general government,

* Mr. Clay prophesied a division into three confederacies, — Northeastern, Southeastern, and the States of the Mississippi Valley.

they not only will not do it, but it would be *a curse to the North* if they would do it. The support of an army and the enormous patronage would produce a centralization and consolidation of power which would leave us a republic only in name. It would add to the already fearful corruption of the general government, and a clique of sensible men once in power could never be turned out. I do not mean that the present Republicans would keep in, for they seem to lack *practical* talent; but once let the statesmen of the *Democratic* party get the control, and with all the enormous powers the central government now possesses, and all the patronage a *conquest* of the South would give them, their term of office might be a long one.

The North have almost always, (except in the war of 1812, when the South controlled the federal government,) been in favor of centralization, and increasing the powers of the President and Congress. Many of the educated and wealthy dread the continual agitation of a Democracy, and are led to despair of the permanence of a democratic system, and openly express their doubts and their preferences for a stronger government. And while the attentions shown to the Prince of Wales, on the part of the mass of our people, merely expressed their feeling of attachment to our fatherland, and a desire to remain in friendship, with others the effect of his visit was to strengthen the anti-democratic tendency.

The present rebellion has increased this disposition to centralization. The party now in power avow these doctrines, and carry them to extremes, not thinking that *they* may not always be in power. Congress has undertaken to regulate the rules of evidence in our State courts, and to regulate the modes of conveying real estate. At a time when the government should have had its ablest man for a legal adviser, we have an Attorney-General, who, on the habeas corpus question, thinks he is wiser, and knows more of the intention of the framers of the Constitution than Jefferson, Marshall, and Story. We have had leading New York papers threatening the Governors of States, and lastly

we have had a New York Unitarian clergyman who has disgraced himself by avowing doctrines, hitherto confined to the Old World, and declaring boldly, in so many words, that like Louis the Fourteenth, of France, the PRESIDENT is the STATE !

Fortunate, that with such a disposition at the North to subserviency, we have a President who, however we may disagree as to his measures, is acknowledged to mean well ; and who has shown no disposition to cruelty, and rather a reluctance to exercise the enormous powers thrust upon him.

The tyranny of majorities is, during the height of an excitement, the most oppressive of tyrannies. This species of tyranny however, is not peculiar to Democracies. Even in absolute governments there is often a tyranny of public opinion entirely independent of the sovereign. But fortunately for us, from the form of government and the division of power with the States and municipal institutions, with constantly shifting local majorities, there will be very few cases where great power, oppressively used, will long remain in the hands of the same set of men.

The perfection of government would be unanimity, or the government of the whole. The nearest practical approach to this yet made is by recourse to majorities. The subject of the representation of minorities has engaged the attention of thinking men in England and in this country.* And John C. Calhoun, whose writings on the subject of government will yet, after the passions of the day have passed away, cause him to be considered one of the greatest and most far-seeing statesmen, (certainly of the purest in morals,) this or any country has ever produced, devoted to this subject his most earnest thought.

The experience of all history has shown that a division of power is one of the greatest safeguards of liberty. So jealous were our forefathers on this subject, and so fearful that the gen-

* See an able and interesting essay on the representation of minorities, lately published by J. Francis Fisher, Esq., of Philadelphia, we believe the first American who has called attention to its importance.

eral government, under pretence of *providing for the general welfare*, (the phrase used in the Constitution,) would swallow up the State government, that *after* its adoption they made an amendment providing, as plain as language can make it, that “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor *prohibited by it to the States*, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people,” an amendment too often overlooked at the North.

And it is remarkable that the preamble to the Constitution, “We, the people of the United States, &c.,” which has always been in the minds of many a plausible argument to prove the intentions of its framers to establish a consolidated government, originally read, “We the people of the *States* of New Hampshire, &c.,” and was altered into its present form because it was uncertain whether all the States would adopt it. What a small foundation for so important an inference.

If the Southern States are regarded as still in the Union, and this is merely an insurrection or rebellion, then we can punish treason only in the mode provided in the Constitution, and the traitors can be tried *only in the district* where the crime is committed. But by all the decisions of courts and usage of nations, as soon as the seceded States establish a *de facto* government and the United States Courts were shut up so that they could no longer protect the people, the allegiance of the people there became due to the Confederate government, and there could be no treason against the United States afterwards. The leaders deserve the severest punishment. Against the masses there is no ill feeling at the North.

If the plan intended by the President and General Scott could have been carried out, we should probably have had peace before this. The President in his inaugural, and Mr. Seward in his dispatches, disavowed all ideas of conquest and subjugation.* If, without invading and laying waste their country, we had sur-

* Inaugural Address. Mr. Seward's Letters.

rounded it by a cordon of military posts and fleets, it would have given time for parties and dissensions to appear among them. By threats of emancipation we have united them. Distress may raise up a party now against Jefferson Davis, but if really united, we have only to look at a map to see that all idea of subjugating and holding the country are illusory. Their cities are of no consequence. We may take them all, and still the country remains unsubdued. And we should be careful how we follow the advice of Unionists who have been persecuted at the South, and who are imbittered by their sufferings. We should pity and aid them ; but they are not safe advisers. George the Third followed the counsels of those who adhered to *his* cause and had been persecuted by our rebel fathers. And what was the result?

They have a country and climate, too, in which our army has not only to go into winter quarters, but into spring, summer, and autumn quarters. They have made railroads to complete their internal communication. They have encouraged manufactures. It is said they have northern mechanics there, introducing mechanic arts. Very likely ; as northern men sold them powder and guns as long as they dared to, and northern people have traded with them, and thus furnished them funds to fight us with.

And the war has been most singularly conducted. It does not look as if we were in earnest. While we have talked a great deal about emancipating slaves, we carried their mails and allowed trade with them down to a very late day, and even now there are regular mails passing between North and South, and persons corresponding with the enemy, and they anticipate all our movements ; and yet, although this is treason by any code, and the government must know these facts, few have been arrested ; no one ever punished for it.

And after once taking possession of a place, and encouraging the Unionists to avow themselves, our army should never have abandoned them to the tender mercies of the rebels, whatever

the cost. The abandonment of Jacksonville has done the Union cause more injury than a dozen defeats in the field.

If this is a civil war, (and, however, reluctantly, we now generally admit it,) then it should be carried on *as a war* and according to the usages of *civilized* nations, and by such means only as are deemed legitimate modes of warfare.

In ancient wars, conquest was considered to give the conquerors the right not only to the public property of the country conquered, but also to the private property of the citizens. The Norman conquest of England was the last example of this confiscation on a great scale. Since then Christianity has made some progress, and now, by all codes of modern civilized war, destruction of private property on land, beyond the actual necessities of war, is universally condemned.* And it has been the constant effort of our own great statesmen, Franklin, Jefferson, and others, to extend this exemption of private property from the sufferings of war to the sea as well as to the land, and thus to mitigate the horrors of war. And devastation of a country seldom contributes much to the legitimate end of war, while it adds to its sufferings, and arouses all the baser passions of human nature. During the last Italian war, it is stated that the marches of the armies seldom interfered with the cultivation of the country, or the enjoyment of private rights.†

And in the war of 1812, one of our complaints against the English was their wanton destruction of private property; and Congress appointed a committee to collect and publish the evidence, in order to arouse the people to prosecute the war with more zeal and unanimity.

One thing, however, we have not done yet. We have not tied any prisoners to the mouth of our cannon and blown them to pieces with charges of powder. McClellan's kind treatment of his prisoners was gall and wormwood to the southern leaders.‡

* Wheaton.

† Lawrence's Wheaton.

‡ W. H. Hurlburt's Notes to the Prince de Joinville's pamphlet.

If devastation and extermination be not a legitimate object of war among nations professing Christianity, is there no platform upon which we can all unite? It seems to me there is — the *restoration* of the CONSTITUTION.

Slavery, it seems to me, is out of the question. It was settled before the President's proclamation. There may be a few northern men (I know of none) who would desire to see slavery reinstated in all its political power. Whether we remain united or separate, it is doomed, at least in the Border States, to a lingering death, and by the folly of its own friends.

On the 22d July, 1861, Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, introduced this resolution into the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and it passed with only two dissenting voices :

“ Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States, now in revolt against the constitutional government, and in arms around the capital. That in this national emergency, Congress, banishing all feelings of mere passion or resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country. That this war is not waged on their part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, nor purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired ; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease.”

And on the 5th August, 1861, the Secretary of War issued the following order to General Butler :

“ It is the desire of the President that all existing rights in all the States be respected and maintained. The war now

prosecuted on the part of the federal government is a war for the Union, and for the preservation of all constitutional rights of States, and the citizens of the States in the Union."

And the *spirit* with which the war is carried on, is all important. If we avow it a war of extermination and confiscation, seven millions of people are not easily exterminated, and after a time we should have to give it up as hopeless, and agree to a separation. It is possible many Democrats may desire this. If so, I am not one of them. It is possible many Republicans may assent to it, fearful that if the Southern States return, they may lose the political power in the restored Union. But of all speculations on the future, speculation as to the effect of reunion on political parties is the idlest. It does not follow that the restored South would go with the Democrats. And however much feeling we may have for the southern people, northern Democrats who always contended, and in the Union still would have contended, for the rights of the South, can have very little sympathy with the *leaders* of secession. Very probably, if the Union could this moment be restored, we should see both parties in Congress contending for southern votes, and trying which could appropriate to them the most money. And as extremists generally unite, the chance of the Republicans in this game (but, perhaps, under some new name) would be far the best. We need look no farther back than our Dorr war for an example.

All government is a compromise, and, while human nature remains as it is, ever must be. Governor Seymour, of New York, in a speech a few years ago, gave a most excellent illustration of this. Suppose all the nations of Europe could at this moment form an alliance and perpetual peace, with some international tribunal for deciding their disputes, on condition of restoring fugitives from serfdom, and thus dispense with their standing armies and enormous taxes, which grind down the poor into the dust. He must be a strange sort of devotee to

liberty who would object to such an increase of human happiness.

And if we ever wish to see a reunited country, we must have more charity for the South, and for each other. We need more charity, not for the politicians at the South, who, to aggrandize themselves, have misled the masses, but for the people, who, right or wrong, think they are fighting in defence of their families, their homes, and property.

And Massachusetts can certainly afford to be charitable. Noble as she is in all good works, how many years is it since she had the same slave laws that South Carolina has now. A century is but a little time in the life of a nation.

Massachusetts formerly not only had black slaves, but white slaves, also. The captives who were taken in the English civil wars were sent over and sold there as slaves. In 1659, her courts sentenced two *white* persons to be sold as slaves to Barbadoes or *Virginia*, for the crime of *siding with the Quakers*!

As for Indian and negro slavery, it existed in Massachusetts very early. The Puritans held slaves as early as 1637, a few years after the settlement. In 1641, we find the following among the Massachusetts laws:—

“There shall never be any bond slavery, villanage, nor captivity among us, unless it be lawful captives taken in *just* wars; and such strangers as willingly sell themselves or *are sold* unto us; and these shall have all the liberties and Christian usages which the law of God established in Israel requires.”

Now here we have the astounding fact of a law of Massachusetts recognizing slavery several years before anything of the sort can be found among the laws of either Virginia or Maryland.

The South had been very much censured for their slave laws. Let us see what Massachusetts had done.

In 1698, she passed a law prohibiting purchasing goods of

slaves under suspicious circumstances. In 1703, she made a law prohibiting masters from emancipating their slaves, unless they gave security that they should not become town paupers. The same year, a statute prohibited any Indian, negro, or mulatto servant or *slave* being abroad after nine o'clock at night, unless on errands for their masters or *owners*. In 1705, by another act, slaves were for certain offences to be sold out of the province. Any negro or mulatto who should strike any of the English or other Christian nation, was to be severely whipped. Marriages were to be allowed between slaves, but I have found no law prohibiting a husband and wife from being sold apart. An import duty on negroes of £4 per head was imposed, but the duty was to be paid back if the negro was exported and "*bona fide* sold in any other plantation." "And the like advantages of the drawback shall be allowed to the purchaser of any negro sold within the Province."

In 1707, we find an act punishing free negroes or mulattoes for harboring any negro or mulatto servant. And in 1718 an act imposed a penalty on every master of a vessel who should carry away any person under age, or *bought* or hired servant, without the master or parent's consent. All these laws are to be found in the old folio volumes of Provincial Statutes.

Now in all these acts there is no concealment — the words *slaves* and *owners* are used. If a southern slaveholder is a robber and a murderer now, then were these old Puritan slaveholders robbers and murderers, and all the people were accessory to these crimes for permitting such laws to exist.

The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts prohibited the enlistment of slaves in the army, thus showing that slavery legally existed there in May, 1775. The reason given is a curious one — that they were contending for the liberties of the colonies, and the admission into the army of any others but freemen would be inconsistent with the principles to be supported, and reflect dishonor on the colony.

Previous to that, viz : October, 1774, an application had been made to them to consider the state of negro slaves in the Province, and, on motion being put that "the matter now subside," it was decided in the affirmative.

A great many of the Indians taken in their *just* wars, were sold for slaves, and this not only in the Province, but to Bermuda and other slave plantations.

In 1754, there were almost two thousand five hundred slaves in Massachusetts, as shown by an incomplete census. Near one thousand of these were in Boston, a very great proportion for the population of Boston at that time ; as great a proportion as now exists in some southern places. In 1776, the number was estimated at three thousand five hundred.

If it is not right to hold the present Massachusetts people responsible for the acts of their ancestors, then it is not right to hold the southern people responsible for the acts of theirs.

But further than this : in the convention for forming the United States Constitution, the question came up about abolishing the slave-trade. — Some were for fixing 1800, and some for 1808. And we find this good old Puritan State voting for holding on to the slave-trade as long as possible, voting for the year 1808 ! Virginia voting in the negative.

And the old Massachusetts papers contain advertisements of " hearty, likely negroes," " likely negro boys," &c., just imported from Africa. And one of the advertisements offers to take New England rum in pay. Advertisements of runaway slaves are also to be found there.

Slavery was abolished or died out in Massachusetts early, because it was not profitable to keep them.

It has always been claimed to the credit of Massachusetts, that her courts abolished slavery by declaring it inconsistent with the principles of the revolution. There were, indeed, some suits in which slaves recovered their freedom, but Nathan Dane probably gives the true history of these suits. He says : —

“In 1773, &c., some slaves did recover against their masters; but these cases are no evidence that there could not be slaves in the Province; for sometimes masters permitted their slaves to recover, to get clear of maintaining them as paupers, when old and infirm,—the effect (as then generally understood) of a judgment against the master on this point of slavery,—hence a very feeble defence was often made by the master, especially when sued by old or infirm slaves, as the masters could not even manumit their slaves without indemnifying their towns against their maintenance as town paupers.” *

The English, too, have always been very fond of reproaching us with slavery, although just now they seem to be coquetting with the South, and desirous of making all the money they can out of them,† for which, perhaps, we cannot blame them, as some of our northern people are doing the same.

One would suppose the English had sins enough of their own to answer for. They carried on the slave-trade for ages, and made it a special point in their treaties with foreign powers to secure to themselves all the profits of furnishing slaves to other countries. And to come down to recent times, their Coolie trade, their opium war with China, their putting their prisoners to death by blowing them away from the cannon’s mouth, and

* Abridgement of the Laws, vol. II., p. 427.

† The Confederate loan attempted in England, is worthy of more consideration than it has received, not so much for the mere aid in money, as for its future effect on public opinion abroad. In the revolt of the South American provinces from Spain, the English merchants had a strong feeling in favor of the colonists, from a desire to have an open trade with them. English speculators gradually became interested in loans to them, and both classes had such an influence that finally, in spite of the British neutrality laws, several thousand English soldiers volunteered and aided in fighting the battles of South American independence, and but for this aid the contest might have been unsuccessful. So in the present case. The so-called loan may be a mere attempt of persons holding claims against the Confederate States to shift the burden from their own shoulders. People buy such claims as tickets in a lottery, and when large numbers become interested, they find means to influence the press and manufacture public opinion.

other abominable cruelties practiced in their late war in India, ought to stop their mouths from censuring other people. People may abuse us in French or Dutch, and it will not trouble us much, as we do not read it. And it is some satisfaction to know, if the English abuse us, that we can find a precedent in their own history for almost all sorts of acts of violence.

But there is one case to which I wish to ask your attention, because it is so little known, and that is the case of the Duchess of Sutherland, the great English friend and patron of Mrs. Stowe, the authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." The Duchess of Sutherland is no doubt a very worthy lady, but one would suppose she must have a very short memory, or otherwise she would be the last person to say anything about the miseries of American slavery, when she herself is living in splendor upon an income derived from one of the greatest pieces of oppression recorded in history, and that, too, of very recent date.

The Sutherland tribe or clan occupied a part of the Scotch Highlands, and covered the larger part of Sutherland county. The chief had the general control of the clan and its property, not as absolute owner, but as a sort of trustee for the tribe. Gradually they introduced the English practise of giving leases, and thus acquired the absolute property. After taking a lease, no tenant could dispute his landlord's title. And about the years 1811-1820, the Countess of Sutherland, heiress in her own right to these ancient chiefs, expelled from their homes and the homes of their fathers, fifteen thousand of her people, (almost as many people as the whole county of Washington contains.) Some were driven to the sea shores, large numbers emigrated to this country, and it was charged that in some cases the houses were even set fire to, in order to expel the poor families. At any rate, the villages were burnt, and the land was then divided into large farms, and has made a splendid estate and brought an immense income to the Countess of Sutherland. She married in 1785 the Marquis of Stafford, who received this property with her, and in 1833 was created Duke of Suther-

land. She died in 1839, and her son, the present Duke, inherited the property, and it is his wife who is the great philanthropist, and who is such an enemy to American slavery.

This expulsion of fifteen thousand people from the homes of their fathers, excited so much feeling, even in aristocratic Europe, that the Countess's agent, Mr. Loch, published a work in justification of it. You will find a full account of it, if you wish to see it, in "Sismondi's Political Economy." He condemns it in the strongest terms, and so must every one who understands the facts. And yet this lady forgets all these facts in the history of her own property, and is very forward in condemning what she thinks oppression in this country, and of patronizing and entertaining at her magnificent palace those who write against slavery here.

And we must have more charity for *each other*. We began with treating the matter too lightly, and every one who knew enough of the South to tell us we had undertaken a difficult task was denounced. Can any serious minded man now look back with anything but disgust to the caricatures, the envelopes, and even the speeches which were so common here two years ago.

We boast of our free schools and our education ; yet any one who had studied a map enough to know the comparative extent of the Southern States, or who had studied statistics enough to know their population and resources, or who had studied history enough to know the results of management similar to ours in former civil wars, and who dared to differ from those who thought the South could be overrun in thirty days, was denounced as a sympathizer with the rebels.

Is it for the interest of the North to have it believed at the South, that nearly half of our people are traitors? And yet rather than forego the malicious pleasure of calling a political opponent by some hard name, a great many Republicans are acting in this suicidal manner.

Charge a set of men or a party with a design, however dishonorable, and if they find their opponents are determined to

slander them, and they cannot avoid the reproach, they have no other resource but to adopt and defend it. The name of Democrat was first given in contempt. So with Locofoco. The party, attempted to be denounced, finding they could not avoid it, adopted the name, and conquered their opponents under these very names of contempt. Shall we learn no wisdom from the past?

The sooner we learn to see things as they are, and act accordingly, the better our chance of success. We may think slavery wrong. If the South think it right, we cannot alter the fact. We may think a high tariff beneficial to the South and West. If they do not, we may as well know the fact.

We hear a great deal said about Divine Providence, and that God is overruling this war to the destruction of slavery. But if there is any such thing as Divine Providence, this war cannot end until we of the North have been punished for *our* sins. The South have been pretty well punished for theirs. But, so far, we have prospered. But for the war, our expenses for support of the poor would have been enormous. We have saved in criminal expenses. We have economized and saved in imports. But there must be a sure punishment in store for the general *corruption*, or there is no such thing as Divine Providence; and hence, chiefly, I infer that the war is not to end yet.

The President, Honest Abraham, is one of the few high officers not accused of plundering the treasury. Against Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase, also, I have heard of no charges. But Senators in Congress are charged with it, generals speculate in cotton, and collectors keep all they can get. And our Breckinridge Democrats (when they get a chance) have not been behindhand in the good work of weakening the government, and thus bringing about a peace. Probably they had some experience before. In buying and hiring vessels, and in buying horses and supplies, the fraud is enormous.

The country has lately been astounded by the discovery of frauds, amounting to millions, in New York city. Mr. Cox, of

Ohio, states, in a speech in Congress, that the Public Documents will show that, at Beaufort, in September, 1862, the United States had sixty-eight superintendents under pay, at \$3,800 per month, to take care of ninety-three negroes, great and small. We have Major-Generals and Brigadier-Generals supported at great expense by the nation to travel around and make political speeches.

The "Independent" (*religious* paper) has openly charged that owners of western railroads have thwarted all plans of opening the Mississippi, in order to increase freights and fill their own pockets. The Potomac was allowed to be closed for a long time. It is supposed that certain railroads had an interest in that. Congressional committees have been appointed to investigate. Mr. Cameron, in his speech at Harrisburg, tells us that some of these committees were got up in order to intimidate and to control patronage. The chairman of one of these committees applied to him for a contract to supply a certain regiment. He, in honest indignation, turned him out of the department. To do the Republicans justice, some of them have openly denounced these frauds. In the United States Senate, on the last days of the last session, Messrs. Chandler and Lane, Republicans, and Henderson and Davis, Union, exposed some of them, but the *telegraph did not give their remarks*, and few Republican papers have noticed them. No one who reads only Republican newspapers would ever know of it, any more than he would know that Wilberforce, Buxton, and a great number of the most enlightened Christians of England condemn our emancipation policy as exciting slave insurrections.

This corruption, too, has its parallel in the past. In the time of our rebellion of 1776, the English government was so corrupt that the King of France actually bought up and owned a member of Parliament!

And yet, instead of exposing and punishing corruption, everybody seems desirous to conceal it, for fear it may injure our cause. Our sensation clergy are constantly publishing war

sermons. That is going with the popular tide. I have seen but one yet (Bishop Clark, of Rhode Island,) who has been bold enough to publish a sermon denouncing the corruption of the times.

Our clergy have given way to that greatest of the temptations of Satan, preaching about other people's sins, and overlooking those of their own hearers. They preach about the sins of Democrats, who have ceased to go to hear them, and about the sins of the Southerners, who cannot hear them. It is a great deal easier sorrowing for the sins of other people, than repenting of our own. But are we not cherishing a self-righteousness, the greatest of all sins?

There are said to be New England clergymen who possess valuable books *taken* from the libraries of clergymen of the South by our troops! If forfeited as rebel property, they belong to the government.

The extent to which the religious element has entered into this war has led to a great deal of humbug. If our politicians can keep popular with the religious people, it covers a multitude of sins. We have had a Secretary of War talking about the *spirit of the Lord moving us to battle*, inspiration from on high, and winning battles after the manner of Joshua, &c., &c., probably *calculating* that his hearers or readers would overlook a few unimportant differences between himself and the old Joshua, viz: that Joshua had not received thirty and odd thousand dollars from the Lord's treasury, for examining a few California land titles; that Joshua was not *inspired* by a salary of eight thousand dollars a year, with the power of enriching all his friends; and that Joshua himself led the hosts of the Lord, and did not stay back and order others to battle.

As, in a free country, one has as good a right as another to speculate upon the designs of Providence, I have said what I have; but it seems to me that a little more humility would not ill become a Christian people, in attempting to foretell the plans of God in the future. We are very apt to consider our will the

will of God. When a misfortune happens to our enemy, it is a judgment of God for his sins ; but if a misfortune befalls us, it is only a trial mercifully appointed by God for our good. It is our part to do our best in the present. What the future may have in store for us, God alone knows.

A few things are among possibilities ; an increase of taxes, which may drive emigration from us into Canada ; an increase of debt ; and as government stocks are free from taxation, we shall presently have a class of rich people, whose property cannot be taxed, while the land and the large families of consumers will suffer. And as this government debt will be nearly all owned at the East, what a temptation ! And what if the two armies should themselves settle the matter !

No one expects, at a time like this, when the life of the country is at stake, the regularity and economy of peace. We expect extravagance, we expect blunders, military and financial. They are unavoidable. We expect corruption. But the Republican party would this day be stronger with the people, if they would themselves (as a few honorably have) come out as a party and try to punish this corruption, instead of calling those who talk about it, secessionists and traitors. Grumbling is one of the very few inalienable rights of Englishmen, and if our modern Joshua will but leave the people that privilege, they will bear a great deal.

The Democratic party of Rhode Island make no factious opposition to the measures of the administration. They elected and supported Governor Sprague, who has supported the administration throughout. They acknowledge the war. It must go on. Separation is destruction to the North. But we have a right to question, and do question, whether threats of devastation, confiscation, and slave insurrection are the right way to bring the war to an honorable end and restore the Union of our fathers.

Two years ago, while the government stood on constitutional ground, this Legislature *unanimously*, every Democrat voting

for it, passed a resolution to sustain the government in the war. And I believe their feelings have not changed yet. Our very last Democratic convention, while protesting against abolition and secession, and all attempts to suppress freedom of speech and the press, have again pledged their support to the government. But they desire a restoration of the Union, and they doubt whether we are pursuing the right course to effect this object.

A P P E N D I X .

AUTHORITIES AND EXTRACTS.

At the present time there is probably no lesson needs inculcating more than that of charity to political opponents. We think no one can read the following extracts, which are only a selection from a large mass of similar matter, all from orthodox sources, and some of which contain a good deal of treason, (*alias* common sense,) without drawing from them the same moral we have drawn at the conclusion.

CHARLES SUMNER in Faneuil Hall, Oct., 1862. (Newspaper report.)

Mr. Sumner appeared as the exponent of his party; and in frankly repudiating the "no party" idea, quoted the pungent words of Col. Benton:—"Wherever you will show me a man with the word 'no party' in his mouth, I will show you a man that figures at the head or dangles at the tail of the most inveterate party that ever existed."

MR. SEWARD to Mr. Adams, November 10, 1862.

"In this country, especially, it is a habit not only consistent with the Constitution, but even essential to its stability, to regard the administration at any time existing as distinct and separate from the government itself, and to canvass the proceedings of the one without a thought of disloyalty to the other."

Speech of ABRAHAM LINCOLN in the House of Representatives, June 12, 1848.—*Cong. Globe*, p. 94, Appendix, 30th Cong., 1st sess.

"Any people anywhere, being inclined, and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world.

Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people, that can, may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority, intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movements. Such minority was precisely the case of the Tories of our own Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines or old laws, but to break up both and make new ones."

From the New York *Tribune*, September 17, 1860.

"We have repeatedly asked those who dissent from our view of this matter whether they do or do not assent to Mr. Jefferson's statement in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, &c., &c. We do heartily accept this doctrine, believing it intrinsically sound, beneficent, and one that, universally accepted, is calculated to prevent the shedding of seas of human blood, *and if it justifies the secession from the British Empire of three millions of colonists in 1776, WE DO NOT SEE WHY IT WOULD NOT JUSTIFY THE SECESSION OF FIVE MILLIONS OF SOUTHERNERS FROM THE FEDERAL UNION IN 1861. If we are mistaken on this point, why does not some one attempt to show wherein and why? For our own part, while we deny the right of slaveholders to hold slaves against the will of the latter, WE CANNOT SEE HOW TWENTY MILLIONS OF PEOPLE CAN RIGHTFULLY HOLD TEN, OR EVEN FIVE, IN DETESTED UNION WITH THEM BY MILITARY FORCE.*"

* * * "But if seven or eight contiguous States shall present themselves authentically at Washington, saying, "we hate the Federal Union; we have withdrawn from it; we give you the choice between acquiescing in our secession and arranging amicably all incidental questions on the one hand, and attempting to subdue us on the other," we *could not stand up for coercion, for subjugation, for we do not think it would be just.*"

"Now as to matter of policy. South Carolina will certainly secede, several other Cotton States will probably follow her example. The Border States are evidently reluctant to do likewise. South Carolina

has grossly insulted them by her dictatorial, reckless course. What she expects and desires, is a clash of arms with the Federal Government, which will at once commend her to the sympathy and co-operation of every slave state, and to the sympathy (at least) of the pro-slavery minority of the free states. . . . We want to obviate this. We would expose the seceders to odium as disunionists, not commend them to pity as the gallant though mistaken upholders of the rights of their section in an unequal military conflict."

The following resolutions passed the United States HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 11th, 1861, by a nearly unanimous vote: —

Resolved, That neither the Federal Government nor the people or governments of the non-slaveholding States have a purpose or a Constitutional right to legislate upon or interfere with slavery in any of the States of the Union.

Resolved, That those persons in the North who do not subscribe to the foregoing proposition are too insignificant in numbers and influence to excite the serious attention or alarm of any portion of the people of the Republic, and that the increase of their numbers and influence does not keep pace with the increase of the aggregate population of the Union.

MR. SEWARD to Mr. Adams, April 10, 1861.

"He (the President) is not disposed to reject a cardinal dogma of the South, namely, that the Federal Government cannot reduce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, even although he were disposed to question that proposition. But in fact the President willingly accepts it as true. Only an Imperial or Despotie Government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State. This Federal Republican system of ours is of all forms of Government, the very one which is most unfitted for such a labor. Happily, however, this is only an imaginary defect. The system has within itself adequate, peaceful, conservative, and recuperative forces. Firmness on the part of the government in preserving and maintaining the public institutions and property, and in executing the laws where authority can be exercised without waging war, combined with such measures of justice, moderation, and forbearance as will disarm reasoning opposition, will be sufficient to secure the public safety until returning reflection . . . shall bring the recusant members cheerfully back into the family. . . . The President on the one hand will not suffer the Federal authorities to

fall into abeyance, nor will he on the other aggravate existing evils by attempts at coercion, which must assume the form of direct war against any of the revolutionary States."

MR. SEWARD to Mr. Dayton, April 22, 1861.

"I need not further elaborate the proposition that the revolution is without a cause; it has not even a pretence.

"It is just as clear that it is without an object. Moral and physical causes have determined inflexibly the character of each one of the territories over which the dispute has arisen, and both parties after the election harmoniously agreed on all the Federal Laws required for their organization. The territories will remain in all respects the same, whether the revolution shall succeed or shall fail. The condition of slavery in the several States will remain just the same, whether it succeed or fail. There is not even a pretext for the complaint that the disaffected States are to be conquered by the United States if the revolution fail; for the rights of the States, and the condition of every human being in them, will remain subject to exactly the same laws and forms of administration, whether the revolution shall succeed or fail. In the one case the States would be Federally connected with the new confederacy; in the other they would, as now, be members of the United States; but their constitutions and laws, customs, habits, and institutions, in either case, will remain the same.

"It is hardly necessary to add to this incontestable statement the further fact that the new President, as well as the citizens through whose suffrages he has come into the administration, has always repudiated all designs, whatever and whenever imputed to him and them, *of disturbing the system of slavery as it exists under the Constitution and laws*. The case, now, would not be fully presented if I were to omit to say that any such effort on his part would be *unconstitutional*, and all his actions in that direction would be prevented by the proper authority, even though they were assented to by Congress and the people."

MR. SEWARD to Mr. Adams, 17th of February, 1862.

"To proclaim the crusade is unnecessary, and it would even be inexpedient, because it would deprive us of the needful and legitimate support of the friends of the Union who are opposed to slavery, but who prefer Union without slavery to disunion with slavery.

“Does France or does Great Britain want to see a social revolution here, with all its horrors, like the slave revolution in St. Domingo? Are these Powers sure that the country or the world is ripe for such a revolution, so that it must certainly be successful? What if inaugurating such a revolution, slavery, protesting against its ferocity and inhumanity, should prove the victor?”

Again, on the 5th of July, 1862, he says: —

“It seems as if the extreme advocates of African slavery and its most vehement opponents were acting in concert together to precipitate a servile war — the former by making the most desperate attempts to overthrow the Federal Union, the latter by demanding an edict of universal emancipation, as a lawful and necessary, if not, as they say, the only legitimate way, of saving the Union.”

President LINCOLN's answer to the Chicago Delegation.

“What good would a proclamation of emancipation from me do, especially as we are now situated? *I do not want to issue a document that the whole world will see must necessarily be inoperative, like the Pope's bull against the comet! Would my word free the slaves, when I cannot even enforce the Constitution in the rebel States? Is there a single court, or magistrate, or individual that would be influenced by it there?* And what reason is there to think, it would have any greater effect upon the slaves than the law of Congress, which I approved and which offers protection and freedom to the slaves of rebel masters, who come within our lines? YET I CANNOT LEARN THAT THE LAW HAS CAUSED A SINGLE SLAVE TO COME OVER TO US.”

New York *Evening Post*, December, 1861.

“It is important to keep this war to its original object, the restoration of the Union and the preservation of the constitution. But under the constitution slavery is exclusively an institution of the States in which it exists. Neither the President nor Congress has authority to interfere with it in ordinary times. . . . *A general act of emancipation would scarcely effect the end at which it was aimed. . . .* Either or both (martial law) would be offensive to large masses of loyal men, both in the Border and Cotton States and might protract our troubles.”

New York *Independent*, May, 1861. Quoted in *Christian Examiner* for September, 1862, page 253.

“The war is not an anti-slavery crusade of the North against the South. Had this been so much as hinted at in the President’s Proclamation, not a regiment would have volunteered.”

HON. C. B. SMITH, late Secretary of the Interior, recently appointed United States District Judge, November 19, 1861.

“Slaves escaping from the rebels might be received as they had been hitherto within the lines of the army, but it was not intended to arm them. If twenty millions of freemen could not, single-handed, subdue the rebellion, it would be a disgrace to them, and they ought to give up the contest.”

GEN. B. F. BUTLER’S Letter to Gov. Andrew, May 9, 1861.

“But I am to act hereafter, it may be, in an enemy’s country, among a servile population, when the question may arise, as it has not yet arisen, — as well in a moral and Christian, as in a political and military point of view, — What shall I then do? Will your Excellency bear with me a moment, while this question is discussed?

“I appreciate fully your Excellency’s suggestions as to the inherent weakness of the rebels, arising from the preponderance of their servile population. The question, then, is, in what manner shall we take advantage of that weakness? By allowing, and, of course, arming, that population, to rise upon the defenceless women and children of the country, carrying rapine, arson, and murder, — all the horrors of San Domingo, a thousand times magnified, — among those whom we hope to reunite with us as brethren, — many of whom are already so, and all who are worth preserving, will be, when this horrible madness shall have passed away, or be threshed out of them? Would your Excellency advise the troops under my command to make war in person upon the defenceless women and children of any part of the Union, accompanied with brutalities too horrible to be named? You will say, God forbid! If we may not do so in person, shall we arm others to do so, over whom we can have no restraint, exercise no control, and who, when once they have tasted blood, may turn the very arms we put into their hands against ourselves, as a part of the oppressing white race? The reading of history — so familiar to your Excellency — will tell you the

bitterest cause of complaint which our fathers had against Great Britain in the war of the Revolution, was the arming, by the British Ministry, of the red man, with the tomahawk and the scalping-knife, against the women and children of the colonies; so that the phrase, 'May we not use all the means that God and Nature have put into our power to subjugate the colonies?' has passed into a legend of infamy against the leader of that Ministry, who used it in Parliament. . . . Could we justify ourselves . . . in letting loose four millions of worse than savages upon the homes and hearts of the South? Can we be justified to the *Christian community of Massachusetts*? . . . When, therefore, (unless I am better advised,) any community in the United States who have met me in honorable warfare, or even in the prosecution of a rebellious war in an honorable manner, shall call upon me for protection against the nameless horrors of a servile insurrection, they shall have it; and from the moment that call is obeyed, I have no doubt we shall be friends, and not enemies.

"The possibility that dishonorable means of defence are to be taken by the rebels against the Government, I do not now contemplate. If, as has been done in a single instance, my men are to be attacked by poison, or, as in another, stricken down by the assassin's knife, and thus murdered, the community using such weapons may require to be taught, that it holds within its own border a more potent means for deadly purposes and indiscriminate slaughter, than any which it can administer to us."

Albany *Evening Journal*, March, 1863.

"Nor can we afford to make the war essentially one of vengeance and destruction. We must not forget that this is the nineteenth century. We must not forget that we are, *professedly*, a *Christian people*. That we have to fight men who are practically savages, will be no excuse for turning savages ourselves. . . . The man who talks, at this late day, about "*wiping out*" *seven millions* of people, talks like a fool. The days when such horrid miracles could be performed, are happily past. We can conquer the Rebellion; but we cannot permanently subjugate the people."

New York *Tribune*, July 17, 1862.

"It *cannot* be put down without Southern help. Its territory is too vast; its forests are too dense; its topography is too rugged; its roads

are too bad. The Union armies must have guides, scouts, spies, and warnings of ambushes and cavalry dashes. Without them, our *armies will melt away and vanish*. We *cannot hold*, even if we could overrun, a vast empire wherein we have no friends. And in hardly any square mile of the Rebel territory, do our Generals find whites disposed to guide, to warn, or in any manner aid them."

Independent, Jan. 15, 1863.

"The future is fair: God and the NEGRO are to save the Republic!"

A long letter from PARSON BROWNLOW, dated Nashville, March 6, among other things, says: "I told the people of the North, in my speeches, as thousands of them will recollect, *what I now repeat, — that is to say, one half of all the slaves in the seceded States, will fight for their owners, and fight to perpetuate their own bondage.*" — [*Boston Courier*.

Lecture of PROF. PARSONS, of Cambridge, quoted by Upton.

"The fourth way of dealing with slaves would be to put weapons into their hands and incite them to armed insurrection. If any such right as this can *ever* exist, it can only spring from the extreme necessity, and from a condition of things which it would be difficult and painful to imagine. With my understanding of what an armed servile insurrection must be, I may illustrate my view of the law thus: an army that invested a city that was supplied with water by a stream flowing into it, would have a military right to cut off the stream, and so reduce the city to submission; but he would have no right, military or other, to poison the waters. There seems to me, as matter of law, a good test for this. The commander of an invading army might certainly, as a military necessity, liberate the slaves and make any use of them which he could make of his own soldiers, but nothing more."

The last prophecy as to the end of the war.

"Universal emancipation must be proclaimed. Then would the war cease *in six months*. . . The necessity of a DICTATORSHIP is evident, to snatch the Nation from the jaws of death." — [THADDEUS STEVENS's speech, Jan. 22, 1862.

The *Independent*, July 10, 1862.

"We are like to be ruined by an Administration that *will not tell the truth*; that spends precious time in playing at *President-making*; that is cutting and shuffling the cards for the next great political campaign."

New York *Tribune*, April 22, 1861.

"If the Administration has not yet *packed its trunk*, the country should be assured of the fact forthwith."

New York *Times*, April 22, 1861.

"It must be confessed that the Administration has presented the *lamentable* spectacle of wasting precious days and weeks in deciding upon *partisan claims to office*, at the very moment that all its energies should have been directed to the state of the country," &c.

New York *Times*, April 27, 1861.

"We did not hesitate to say to the President, that, unless he acted with more vigor and more courage, . . . he ran the risk of plunging the Government into embarrassments, from which it could only be rescued by *some one who should more accurately represent* the sentiments and purposes of the American people. . . . If they are thwarted and treated with contempt, . . . they will work out a path for themselves, *even if they have to override the Government*, which ought to guide them to the accomplishment of its own wise and just ends."

New York *Times*, April, 1861.

"The President runs no small risk of being *superseded* in his office, if he undertakes to thwart the clear and manifest determination of the people to maintain the authority of the Government of the United States, and to protect its honor."

Report of the Committee on Conduct of the War, 1863.

"Not upon those whose duty it was to provide the means necessary to put down the rebellion, *but upon those whose duty it was to rightfully apply* those means, and the agents they employed for that purpose, rests the blame, if any, that the hopes of the nation have not been realized, &c."

Who ought to be put in Fort Lafayette? From the speech of MR. VAN WYCK, of New York, (Republican,) in Congress, Feb. 23, 1862.

“With a single exception, when has one of these men [the plunderers of the treasury,] been court-martialed or punished? To-day, *they have injured the Republic more than the South in arms*. Had they been arrested, and placed under the gallows, or in Fort Lafayette, our army would have been stronger, and our people at home more united. No wonder that your soldiers and their friends are dissatisfied. They cannot appreciate the *patriotism of stealing*.”

New York *Tribune*, March 28.

“This nation has learned, by a very extensive experience, that war is a season of prosperity to scoundrels. It is, to some extent, inevitably so, but in our case, *immeasurably and incredibly* so. We have rascals of all degrees and kinds, incapable imposters, *doing no work, and drawing full pay*, — gold gamblers, to whom patriotism and loyalty are but empty names, and in whose eyes there is nothing but speculation, — swindlers and robbers all. Every one of them is practically a *traitor*,” &c., &c.

From the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for January, 1862, a quarterly theological magazine, published at Andover, Mass., page 193.

“The evidence for the inspiration of the [119th] psalm is clearer than the evidence that its apparent meaning is its real one: therefore, if it be needful to adopt the alternative that the psalm is not of divine origin, or else that it does not utter a wish for the woes of the traitors’ *household*, we have a logical right to interpret the psalm as breathing a spirit not of positive desire for these woes, but of *cordial submission* to them. [!!] Thus, —

“It is the divine plan to afflict the small household of the traitor, and thereby save the large multitudes who had otherwise been undone by his treason. Therefore, while rivers of water run down mine eyes, I sing, —

“‘Let his children be fatherless,

“‘And his wife a widow:

“‘Let his *children* be continually *vagabonds*, and beg:

“‘Let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places.

“ ‘He has stirred up his comrades to inhuman and relentless deeds : and so I rest satisfied with thine arrangement :

“ ‘Let there be *none to extend mercy* unto him :

“ ‘Neither let there be *any favor to his fatherless children*.

“ ‘Let his posterity be cut off ;

“ ‘And in the generation following, let their name be blotted out.’

“ We have no reason to deny that David shuddered when he was inspired to utter them.”

God save the country from the *tender mercies* of *such* Christians.

As the proverb says, we can bear the misfortunes *of others* with the most Christian resignation.

The article is worthy of the days of the Spanish Inquisition. It is horrible blasphemy.

From the *Christian Inquirer*, Unitarian, Anti-Slavery, published at New York.

“ *In several libraries of New England clergymen we have seen choice volumes of great cost, bearing the names of Southern ministers, to whom they still belong, although they have been sent North as gifts from Yankee soldiers who had appropriated them. Some Massachusetts parlors are said to be carpeted with spoils of another kind. Now, if any one asks what has become of the Union party, once so strong at the South, we answer that, in part, they have been alienated from the government by the unjustifiable outrages committed by wicked or thoughtless federal soldiers. At Beaufort, South Carolina, tombs were violated. At Holly Springs, Mississippi, a communion table was used in behalf of ‘euchre’ and ‘old sledge.’ Such tales of wrong have infuriated many who were disposed to be friends of the Union, and their righteous indignation has had something to do with reverses that have overtaken our arms.*”

The *Inquirer* also quotes, with indignation, “a letter of an officer, written at Camp Saxton, Beaufort, South Carolina, in which he says : ‘The splendid mansion once occupied by that arch-rebel, T. Butler King, is on a Georgia island, and we stripped it of everything. I write this letter on his writing-desk, which, with his piano, was presented to me, on my return.’”

CHARLES SUMNER on the True Grandeur of Nations.

“It cannot be doubted that this strange and unblessed conjunction of the Christian clergy with war, has had no little influence in blinding the world to the truth now beginning to be recognized, that *Christianity forbids the whole custom of war*.

“Such is the true image of Christian duty; nor can I readily perceive the difference in principle between those ministers of the gospel who themselves gird on the sword, as in the olden time, and those others who, unarmed and in customary black, lend the sanction of their presence to the martial array, or to any form of preparation for war.”

R. G. HAZARD'S Essays.

“The disposition to do wrong is often not so much a desire to do the thing forbidden, as to break the fetters and assert the dignity and supremacy of the mind.”

MORAL.

People who live in glass houses should not throw stones at other people's windows.

Resolutions adopted by the Democratic State Convention of Rhode Island, March, 1863.

Resolved, That we adhere to the wise division of power established by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, and that we look with alarm upon any encroachment of one branch of the government upon the prerogatives of another, or upon the reserved rights of the States, as tending to a most dangerous centralization of power.

Resolved, That the Government of the United States has no existence except by virtue and force of the Constitution of the United States, and that the Constitution is the highest law of the land; and that the President and Congress of the United States have no powers except those delegated to them by it.

Resolved, That we enter our solemn protest against the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and all attempts to suppress the freedom of speech and of the press in the loyal States, and against those projects

of emancipation which we regard as tending to destroy all prospects of a re-union of the States.

Resolved, That the thanks of the people of this State are due to the HON. WILLIAM SPRAGUE, our late Governor, and that we believe it was chiefly owing to his influence and determined opposition that no attempt has been made to suppress the freedom of speech and of the press in this State.

Resolved, That secession and abolitionism are alike destructive and pernicious doctrines, and that both must be rooted out of the nation before the Union can be considered out of danger.

Resolved, That the Democratic party of Rhode Island, detesting alike these abominable and pernicious ideas, renew their unalterable allegiance to the Constitution, and pledge their *heartly support to the President of the United States and the national administration* so far as their acts and doings are in accordance therewith.

Resolved, That we tender our hearty thanks to those brave and patriotic citizens of Rhode Island who are defending the flag of their country in the Union army, and that we extend our warmest sympathies to the relatives and friends of those who have nobly fallen in defence of the Constitution and the Union.

71.2009.084 09234

